

# Characterizing Computable Analysis with Differential Equations

Kerry Ojakian<sup>1</sup> (with Manuel L. Campagnolo<sup>2</sup>)

<sup>1</sup>SQIG/IT Lisbon and IST, Portugal  
ojakian@math.ist.utl.pt

<sup>2</sup>DM/ISA, Lisbon University of Technology and SQIG/IT Lisbon

Computability and Complexity in Analysis, 2008

# Outline

- 1 Introduction
- 2 Technical Framework
- 3 Results: Past and Present
- 4 Discussion of the Proof
- 5 Conclusion

# Outline

- 1 Introduction
- 2 Technical Framework
- 3 Results: Past and Present
- 4 Discussion of the Proof
- 5 Conclusion

# Characterizing Computable Analysis

- Results of the form “ $\mathcal{CA} = \text{FA}$ ”.
- **Real Recursive Functions** introduced by C. Moore 1996.  
Function algebras with operations like this:

*Solve a differential equation and keep the result.*

Modified by Bournez and Hainry 2005, 2006.

Characterize Elementary Computable and Computable.

# Characterizing Computable Analysis

- Results of the form “ $\mathcal{CA} = \text{FA}$ ”.
- **Real Recursive Functions** introduced by C. Moore 1996.  
Function algebras with operations like this:

*Solve a differential equation and keep the result.*

Modified by Bournez and Hainry 2005, 2006.

Characterize Elementary Computable and Computable.

# Outline

- 1 Introduction
- 2 Technical Framework**
- 3 Results: Past and Present
- 4 Discussion of the Proof
- 5 Conclusion

# Computable Analysis

## Definition

- $f(x) \in \mathbf{C}(\mathbb{R})$ :

*There is a **computable** function  $F^x(n)$  with an oracle for the real number  $x$  such that  $|f(x) - F^x(n)| \leq 1/n$ .*

- $\mathbf{E}(\mathbb{R})$ : Like  $\mathbf{C}(\mathbb{R})$ , replacing **computable** by **elementary computable**.

# Computable Analysis

## Definition

- $f(x) \in \mathbf{C}(\mathbb{R})$ :

*There is a **computable** function  $F^x(n)$  with an oracle for the real number  $x$  such that*  
 $|f(x) - F^x(n)| \leq 1/n.$

- $\mathbf{E}(\mathbb{R})$ : Like  $\mathbf{C}(\mathbb{R})$ , replacing **computable** by **elementary computable**.



# Function Algebras

## Definition

Suppose  $\mathcal{B}$  is a set of functions (i.e. the basic functions) and  $\mathcal{O}$  is a set of operations. Then  $\text{FA}[\mathcal{B}; \mathcal{O}]$  is the smallest set of functions containing  $\mathcal{B}$  and closed under  $\mathcal{O}$ .

Basic Functions:

- Constant functions:  $0, 1, -1, \pi$
- Projection functions “P” (example:  $U(x, y) = x$ )
- $\theta_k(x) = \begin{cases} 0, & x < 0; \\ x^k, & x \geq 0. \end{cases}$

Operation: **comp** (Composes the given functions).

# Function Algebras

## Definition

Suppose  $\mathcal{B}$  is a set of functions (i.e. the basic functions) and  $\mathcal{O}$  is a set of operations. Then  $\text{FA}[\mathcal{B}; \mathcal{O}]$  is the smallest set of functions containing  $\mathcal{B}$  and closed under  $\mathcal{O}$ .

Basic Functions:

- Constant functions:  $0, 1, -1, \pi$
- Projection functions “P” (example:  $U(x, y) = x$ )
- $\theta_k(x) = \begin{cases} 0, & x < 0; \\ x^k, & x \geq 0. \end{cases}$

Operation: **comp** (Composes the given functions).

# The Differential Equation Operation

## Definition

**ODE** is the operation:

- **Input:** Functions:  $\vec{g}(\bar{x})$ ,  $\vec{f}(y, \bar{u}, \bar{x})$ .
- **Output:**  $h_1(y, \bar{x})$  where  $(h_1, \dots, h_n)$  is the solution to the IVP:

$$\begin{aligned}\vec{h}(0, \bar{x}) &= \vec{g}(\bar{x}) \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \vec{h} &= \vec{f}(y, \vec{h}, \bar{x})\end{aligned}$$

## Definition

**LI** is the operation defined like ODE, except that  $f$  must be linear in  $\vec{h}$ .

# The Differential Equation Operation

## Definition

**ODE** is the operation:

- **Input:** Functions:  $\vec{g}(\bar{x})$ ,  $\vec{f}(y, \bar{u}, \bar{x})$ .
- **Output:**  $h_1(y, \bar{x})$  where  $(h_1, \dots, h_n)$  is the solution to the IVP:

$$\begin{aligned}\vec{h}(0, \bar{x}) &= \vec{g}(\bar{x}) \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \vec{h} &= \vec{f}(y, \vec{h}, \bar{x})\end{aligned}$$

## Definition

**LI** is the operation defined like ODE, except that  $f$  must be linear in  $\vec{h}$ .

# The Limit Operation

## Definition

**LIM\*** is the operation:

- **Input:**  $f(t, \bar{x})$
- **Output:**  $F(\bar{x}) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} f(t, \bar{x})$ , if 1) the limit exists, 2)  $|F(\bar{x}) - f(t, \bar{x})| \leq 1/t$ , and 3)  $F$  is  $\mathcal{C}^2$ .

## Definition

If  $\mathcal{F}$  a set of functions, then  $\mathcal{F}(\text{LIM}^*)$  is  $\mathcal{F}$  closed under the operation  $\text{LIM}^*$ .

# The Limit Operation

## Definition

**LIM\*** is the operation:

- **Input:**  $f(t, \bar{x})$
- **Output:**  $F(\bar{x}) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} f(t, \bar{x})$ , if 1) the limit exists, 2)  $|F(\bar{x}) - f(t, \bar{x})| \leq 1/t$ , and 3)  $F$  is  $\mathcal{C}^2$ .

## Definition

If  $\mathcal{F}$  a set of functions, then  $\mathcal{F}(\text{LIM}^*)$  is  $\mathcal{F}$  closed under the operation  $\text{LIM}^*$ .

# Outline

- 1 Introduction
- 2 Technical Framework
- 3 Results: Past and Present**
- 4 Discussion of the Proof
- 5 Conclusion

# Elementary Computability.

- Let  $\mathcal{L}_k$  abbreviate  $\text{FA}[0, 1, -1, \pi, \theta_k, \text{P}; \text{comp}, \text{LI}]$ .
- Let  $\mathcal{L}$  abbreviate  $\text{FA}[0, 1, -1, \text{P}; \text{comp}, \text{LI}]$ .

Originally Bournez and Hainry, extended by us:

## Theorem

$$\mathbf{E}(\mathbb{R}) = \mathcal{L}_k(\text{LIM}) = \mathcal{L}(\text{LIM}), \text{ for } k \geq 3.$$



# Elementary Computability.

- Let  $\mathcal{L}_k$  abbreviate  $\text{FA}[0, 1, -1, \pi, \theta_k, \text{P}; \text{comp}, \text{LI}]$ .
- Let  $\mathcal{L}$  abbreviate  $\text{FA}[0, 1, -1, \text{P}; \text{comp}, \text{LI}]$ .

Originally Bournez and Hainry, extended by us:

## Theorem

$$\mathbf{E}(\mathbb{R}) = \mathcal{L}_k(\text{LIM}) = \mathcal{L}(\text{LIM}), \text{ for } k \geq 3.$$

## Computability: Previous Approach

### Definition

The operation **UMU**:

**Input:**  $f(t, \bar{x})$  (with unique root and other conditions)

**Output:** Function  $F(\bar{x}) =$  the unique  $t$  such that  $f(t, \bar{x}) = 0$ .

### Definition

Let  $RT_k$  be  $FA[0, 1, -1, \theta_k, P; \text{comp}, \text{CLI}, \text{UMU}]$

Theorem ( Bournez and Hainry 2005, 2006 )

$$\mathcal{C}^2 \cap [\mathbf{C}(\mathbb{R})] = [RT_k(\text{LIM}^*)], \text{ for } k \geq 3$$

## Computability: Previous Approach

### Definition

The operation **UMU**:

**Input:**  $f(t, \bar{x})$  (with unique root and other conditions)

**Output:** Function  $F(\bar{x}) =$  the unique  $t$  such that  $f(t, \bar{x}) = 0$ .

### Definition

Let  $RT_k$  be  $FA[0, 1, -1, \theta_k, P; \text{comp}, \text{CLI}, \text{UMU}]$

Theorem ( Bournez and Hainry 2005, 2006 )

$$\mathcal{C}^2 \cap [\mathbf{C}(\mathbb{R})] = [RT_k(\text{LIM}^*)], \text{ for } k \geq 3$$

## Computability: Previous Approach

### Definition

The operation **UMU**:

**Input:**  $f(t, \bar{x})$  (with unique root and other conditions)

**Output:** Function  $F(\bar{x}) =$  the unique  $t$  such that  $f(t, \bar{x}) = 0$ .

### Definition

Let  $RT_k$  be  $FA[0, 1, -1, \theta_k, P; \text{comp}, \text{CLI}, \text{UMU}]$

Theorem ( Bournez and Hainry 2005, 2006 )

$$\mathcal{C}^2 \cap [\mathbf{C}(\mathbb{R})] = [RT_k(\text{LIM}^*)], \text{ for } k \geq 3$$

# Computability: Our Approach

## Definition

Let  $DF_k$  be  $FA[0, 1, -1, \theta_k, P; \text{comp}, \text{ODE}]$

Our Result:

## Theorem

$\mathcal{C}^2 \cap [\mathbf{C}(\mathbb{R})] = [DF_k(\text{LIM}^*)]$ , for  $k \geq 3$ .

# Computability: Our Approach

## Definition

Let  $DF_k$  be  $FA[0, 1, -1, \theta_k, P; \text{comp}, \text{ODE}]$

Our Result:

## Theorem

$\mathcal{C}^2 \cap [\mathbf{C}(\mathbb{R})] = [DF_k(LIM^*)]$ , for  $k \geq 3$ .

# Motivation

- **General Goal: Provide alternative model for Computable Analysis.**
- Specific Goal: Improve upon previous characterizations.
- Some technical work is easier with this model? (e.g. like showing a function is or is not computable)

# Motivation

- General Goal: Provide alternative model for Computable Analysis.
- Specific Goal: Improve upon previous characterizations.
- Some technical work is easier with this model? (e.g. like showing a function is or is not computable)



# Motivation

- General Goal: Provide alternative model for Computable Analysis.
- Specific Goal: Improve upon previous characterizations.
- Some technical work is easier with this model? (e.g. like showing a function is or is not computable)

# Outline

- 1 Introduction
- 2 Technical Framework
- 3 Results: Past and Present
- 4 Discussion of the Proof**
- 5 Conclusion

# Useful Function Algebras

## Definition

The operation **Inverse**:

**Input:**  $f(t, \bar{x})$  (which bijection in  $t$  and other conditions)

**Output:** The inverse of  $f$

- Let  $IV_k$  be  $FA[0, 1, -1, \theta_k, P; \text{comp}, \text{LI}, \text{Inverse}]$
- Let  $IV_k^{(c)}$  be the functions of  $IV_k$  that can be defined using  $c$  or less applications of the operation Inverse.
- Let  $RT_k^{(c)}$  be the functions of  $RT_k$  that can be defined using  $c$  or less applications of the operation UMU.

# Useful Function Algebras

## Definition

The operation **Inverse**:

**Input:**  $f(t, \bar{x})$  (which bijection in  $t$  and other conditions)

**Output:** The inverse of  $f$

- Let  $IV_k$  be  $FA[0, 1, -1, \theta_k, P; \text{comp}, \text{LI}, \text{Inverse}]$
- Let  $IV_k^{(c)}$  be the functions of  $IV_k$  that can be defined using  $c$  or less applications of the operation Inverse.
- Let  $RT_k^{(c)}$  be the functions of  $RT_k$  that can be defined using  $c$  or less applications of the operation UMU.

# Useful Function Algebras

## Definition

The operation **Inverse**:

**Input:**  $f(t, \bar{x})$  (which bijection in  $t$  and other conditions)

**Output:** The inverse of  $f$

- Let  $IV_k$  be  $FA[0, 1, -1, \theta_k, P; \text{comp}, \text{LI}, \text{Inverse}]$
- Let  $IV_k^{(c)}$  be the functions of  $IV_k$  that can be defined using  $c$  or less applications of the operation Inverse.
- Let  $RT_k^{(c)}$  be the functions of  $RT_k$  that can be defined using  $c$  or less applications of the operation UMU.

# Outline

- 1  $RT_k^{(c)} \subseteq IV_k^{(c)} \subseteq DF_{k-c} \subseteq \mathbf{C}(\mathbb{R})$ , for any  $c \geq 0$  and  $k \geq c + 3$   
(now, we would like something like “ $\mathbf{C}(\mathbb{R}) \subseteq RT_k^{(c)}$ ”)
- 2 For some constant “bh”, and for any  $k \geq 3$ , we have:

$$c^2 \cap [\mathbf{C}(\mathbb{R})] \subseteq [RT_k^{(bh)}(\text{LIM}^*)].$$

- 3 Closing under limits and considering compact restrictions to complete proof.

Obtains our theorem:

$$c^2 \cap [\mathbf{C}(\mathbb{R})] = [DF_k(\text{LIM}^*)],$$

for  $k \geq 3$ .

## Outline

- 1  $RT_k^{(c)} \subseteq IV_k^{(c)} \subseteq DF_{k-c} \subseteq \mathbf{C}(\mathbb{R})$ , for any  $c \geq 0$  and  $k \geq c + 3$   
(now, we would like something like “ $\mathbf{C}(\mathbb{R}) \subseteq RT_k^{(c)}$ ”)
- 2 For some constant “bh”, and for any  $k \geq 3$ , we have:

$$c^2 \cap [\mathbf{C}(\mathbb{R})] \subseteq [RT_k^{(bh)}(\text{LIM}^*)].$$

- 3 Closing under limits and considering compact restrictions to complete proof.

Obtains our theorem:

$$c^2 \cap [\mathbf{C}(\mathbb{R})] = [DF_k(\text{LIM}^*)],$$

for  $k \geq 3$ .

## Outline

- 1  $RT_k^{(c)} \subseteq IV_k^{(c)} \subseteq DF_{k-c} \subseteq \mathbf{C}(\mathbb{R})$ , for any  $c \geq 0$  and  $k \geq c + 3$   
(now, we would like something like “ $\mathbf{C}(\mathbb{R}) \subseteq RT_k^{(c)}$ ”)
- 2 For some constant “bh”, and for any  $k \geq 3$ , we have:

$$c^2 \cap [\mathbf{C}(\mathbb{R})] \subseteq [RT_k^{(bh)}(\text{LIM}^*)].$$

- 3 Closing under limits and considering compact restrictions to complete proof.

Obtains our theorem:

$$c^2 \cap [\mathbf{C}(\mathbb{R})] = [DF_k(\text{LIM}^*)],$$

for  $k \geq 3$ .



## Outline

- 1  $RT_k^{(c)} \subseteq IV_k^{(c)} \subseteq DF_{k-c} \subseteq \mathbf{C}(\mathbb{R})$ , for any  $c \geq 0$  and  $k \geq c + 3$   
(now, we would like something like “ $\mathbf{C}(\mathbb{R}) \subseteq RT_k^{(c)}$ ”)
- 2 For some constant “bh”, and for any  $k \geq 3$ , we have:

$$c^2 \cap [\mathbf{C}(\mathbb{R})] \subseteq [RT_k^{(bh)}(\text{LIM}^*)].$$

- 3 Closing under limits and considering compact restrictions to complete proof.

Obtains our theorem:

$$c^2 \cap [\mathbf{C}(\mathbb{R})] = [DF_k(\text{LIM}^*)],$$

for  $k \geq 3$ .

$$RT_k^{(c)} \subseteq IV_k^{(c)}$$

Simulate any application of UMU with a single application of Inverse. Given a function  $f(t)$  to find its root:

- Find  $f^{-1}(t)$  with Inverse.
- The root is then  $f^{-1}(0)$ .

$$IV_k^{(c)} \subseteq DF_{k-c}$$

Main point: For  $f \in DF_r$  we can find its inverse because:

$$(f^{-1}(t))' = \frac{1}{f'(f^{-1}(t))}$$

But ... then we also need  $f' \in DF_r$ .

In general, if  $f \in DF_r$  then  $f' \in DF_{r-1}$ . Thus:

*For  $c$  inverses, need to go down to  $DF_{k-c}$*

Main point: For  $f \in DF_r$  we can find its inverse because:

$$(f^{-1}(t))' = \frac{1}{f'(f^{-1}(t))}$$

But ... then we also need  $f' \in DF_r$ .

In general, if  $f \in DF_r$  then  $f' \in DF_{r-1}$ . Thus:

*For  $c$  inverses, need to go down to  $DF_{k-c}$*

# $DF_k \subseteq \mathbf{C}(\mathbb{R})$

Induction on  $DF_k$ :

- Basic Functions
- Composition
- The ODE Operation (the main step)

Two approaches:

- 1 Use Collins/Graça 2008 (this conference).  
Straightforward Induction: *Any function of  $DF_k$  is computable*
- 2 Use Graça/Zhong/Buescu 2007.  
Induction: *Any function in  $DF_k$  and any partial derivative of it is computable, and furthermore have r.e.-open domains.*

# $DF_k \subseteq \mathbf{C}(\mathbb{R})$

Induction on  $DF_k$ :

- Basic Functions
- Composition
- The ODE Operation (the main step)

Two approaches:

- 1 Use Collins/Graça 2008 (this conference).  
Straightforward Induction: *Any function of  $DF_k$  is computable*
- 2 Use Graça/Zhong/Buescu 2007.  
Induction: *Any function in  $DF_k$  and any partial derivative of it is computable, and furthermore have r.e.-open domains.*

# $DF_k \subseteq \mathbf{C}(\mathbb{R})$

Induction on  $DF_k$ :

- Basic Functions
- Composition
- The ODE Operation (the main step)

Two approaches:

- 1 Use Collins/Graça 2008 (this conference).  
Straightforward Induction: *Any function of  $DF_k$  is computable*
- 2 Use Graça/Zhong/Buescu 2007.  
Induction: *Any function in  $DF_k$  and any partial derivative of it is computable, and furthermore have r.e.-open domains.*

## Finishing the Proof

Thus we have shown:

$$\mathbf{RT}_k^{(c)} \subseteq \mathbf{IV}_k^{(c)} \subseteq \mathbf{DF}_{k-c} \subseteq \mathbf{C}(\mathbb{R})$$

We also have:

$$\mathcal{C}^2 \cap [\mathbf{C}(\mathbb{R})] \subseteq [\mathbf{RT}_k^{(\text{bh})}(\text{LIM}^*)]$$

Closing under limits and considering compact restrictions we obtain our theorem:

$$\mathcal{C}^2 \cap [\mathbf{C}(\mathbb{R})] = [\mathbf{DF}_k(\text{LIM}^*)],$$

for  $k \geq 3$



## Finishing the Proof

Thus we have shown:

$$\mathbf{RT}_k^{(c)} \subseteq \mathbf{IV}_k^{(c)} \subseteq \mathbf{DF}_{k-c} \subseteq \mathbf{C}(\mathbb{R})$$

We also have:

$$\mathcal{C}^2 \cap [\mathbf{C}(\mathbb{R})] \subseteq [\mathbf{RT}_k^{(\text{bh})}(\text{LIM}^*)]$$

Closing under limits and considering compact restrictions we obtain our theorem:

$$\mathcal{C}^2 \cap [\mathbf{C}(\mathbb{R})] = [\mathbf{DF}_k(\text{LIM}^*)],$$

for  $k \geq 3$

## Finishing the Proof

Thus we have shown:

$$\mathbf{RT}_k^{(c)} \subseteq \mathbf{IV}_k^{(c)} \subseteq \mathbf{DF}_{k-c} \subseteq \mathbf{C}(\mathbb{R})$$

We also have:

$$\mathcal{C}^2 \cap [\mathbf{C}(\mathbb{R})] \subseteq [\mathbf{RT}_k^{(\text{bh})}(\text{LIM}^*)]$$

Closing under limits and considering compact restrictions we obtain our theorem:

$$\mathcal{C}^2 \cap [\mathbf{C}(\mathbb{R})] = [\mathbf{DF}_k(\text{LIM}^*)],$$

for  $k \geq 3$

# Outline

- 1 Introduction
- 2 Technical Framework
- 3 Results: Past and Present
- 4 Discussion of the Proof
- 5 Conclusion

# Conclusion

We have a new characterization of Computable Analysis. While it seems to be an improvement, we consider ways to further improve it:

- Show it is useful!
- Remove the restriction to  $\mathcal{C}^2$  functions (more than 90% sure it can be done).
- Simplify classes to their “analytic versions” (i.e. remove  $\theta_k$  function ... 75% sure it is true, though it looks difficult).

Thus we conjecture:

$$[\mathbf{C}(\mathbb{R})] = [\mathbf{RT}(\mathbf{LIM})] = [\mathbf{IV}(\mathbf{LIM})] = [\mathbf{DF}(\mathbf{LIM})]$$

# Conclusion

We have a new characterization of Computable Analysis. While it seems to be an improvement, we consider ways to further improve it:

- Show it is useful!
- Remove the restriction to  $\mathcal{C}^2$  functions (more than 90% sure it can be done).
- Simplify classes to their “analytic versions” (i.e. remove  $\theta_k$  function ... 75% sure it is true, though it looks difficult).

Thus we conjecture:

$$[\mathbf{C}(\mathbb{R})] = [\mathbf{RT}(\mathbf{LIM})] = [\mathbf{IV}(\mathbf{LIM})] = [\mathbf{DF}(\mathbf{LIM})]$$

## Conclusion

We have a new characterization of Computable Analysis. While it seems to be an improvement, we consider ways to further improve it:

- Show it is useful!
- Remove the restriction to  $\mathcal{C}^2$  functions (more than 90% sure it can be done).
- Simplify classes to their “analytic versions” (i.e. remove  $\theta_k$  function ... 75% sure it is true, though it looks difficult).

Thus we conjecture:

$$[\mathbf{C}(\mathbb{R})] = [\mathbf{RT}(\mathbf{LIM})] = [\mathbf{IV}(\mathbf{LIM})] = [\mathbf{DF}(\mathbf{LIM})]$$

## Conclusion

We have a new characterization of Computable Analysis. While it seems to be an improvement, we consider ways to further improve it:

- Show it is useful!
- Remove the restriction to  $\mathcal{C}^2$  functions (more than 90% sure it can be done).
- Simplify classes to their “analytic versions” (i.e. remove  $\theta_k$  function ... 75% sure it is true, though it looks difficult).

Thus we conjecture:

$$[\mathbf{C}(\mathbb{R})] = [\mathbf{RT}(\mathbf{LIM})] = [\mathbf{IV}(\mathbf{LIM})] = [\mathbf{DF}(\mathbf{LIM})]$$

## Conclusion

We have a new characterization of Computable Analysis. While it seems to be an improvement, we consider ways to further improve it:

- Show it is useful!
- Remove the restriction to  $\mathcal{C}^2$  functions (more than 90% sure it can be done).
- Simplify classes to their “analytic versions” (i.e. remove  $\theta_k$  function ... 75% sure it is true, though it looks difficult).

Thus we conjecture:

$$[\mathbf{C}(\mathbb{R})] = [\mathbf{RT}(\mathbf{LIM})] = [\mathbf{IV}(\mathbf{LIM})] = [\mathbf{DF}(\mathbf{LIM})]$$